



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/788,675	02/21/2001	Hideki Hino	325772022500	6035

25227 7590 06/16/2005
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

MILIA, MARK R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/788,675

Applicant(s)

HINO ET AL.

Examiner

Mark R. Milia

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 1/13/05, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, claims 1-12 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/13/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims 1-12, particularly claims 1 and 7, wherein on pages 1-3, the applicant asserts that the references of Namikawa and Tanimoto do not disclose "a power supply control device for controlling power supply to the optional device in response to the transfer state stored in the second storage medium". The examiner respectfully disagrees, in particular because in combination the references of Namikawa and Tanimoto disclose such a limitation. Namikawa discloses a system with a power supply (see Fig. 1, column 4 lines 46-48, and column 11 lines 55-64), an optional device (see Fig. 1, column 3 lines 44-56, and column 11 lines 13-28 and 50-51), and a transfer state being stored in a second storage medium (see column 6 lines 7-10). Namikawa only fails to disclose the controlling of the power supply in response to the transfer state. Tanimoto discloses a system that controls a power supply in cases in which program rewriting

Art Unit: 2622

actions are involved for such things as program changes or version upgrades. The system senses, through use of an IC card, that a program rewrite is to take place and a transfer program initializes the control action, which will in turn decide whether to turn the power supply ON/OFF. Thus, this system controls the power supply according to the transfer state of a program stored in memory that is to be transferred to an image processing unit, which is analogous to the claim limitation, when combined with Namikawa, set forth in claims 1 and 7. Support can be found in paragraphs [0022]-[0034] of Tanimoto.

3. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-12, as cited in the Office Action dated 10/21/04, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), is maintained and repeated in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6094698 to Namikawa in view of Japanese Patent Laid-Open Publication No. 10-213997 to Tanimoto cited in Information Disclosure Statement dated 2/21/01, a translation of which is attached and used as basis for rejection.

Regarding claim 1, Namikawa discloses an image processing apparatus, comprising: a first storage medium for storing a control program (see column 3 line 66-column 4 line 3), a control device for controlling image processing of the image processing apparatus by the control program stored in the first storage medium (see column 4 lines 7 and 11-15), a transfer device for transferring the control program from an external device to the first storage medium (see column 4 lines 49-51 and column 5 lines 37-60), a nonvolatile second storage medium for storing a transfer state of the control program (see column 6 lines 1-10), an optional device (see column 3 lines 44-56, column 11 lines 13-28 and 50-51), and a power supply (see column 4 lines 46-48 and Fig. 1).

Namikawa does not disclose expressly a power supply control device for controlling power supply to the optional device in response to the transfer state stored in the second storage medium.

Tanimoto discloses a power supply control device for controlling power supply to the optional device in response to the transfer state stored in the second storage medium (see paragraphs 0006-0008, 0011 lines 6-9, 0013, 0019 lines 6-7, and 0022-0034).

Namikawa & Tanimoto are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, printing apparatus with program version upgrade.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the power supply control of an optional device of Tanimoto with the image processing apparatus of Namikawa.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to prevent printer malfunction such as overheating and incorrect drive motor rotation when control program are being upgraded (see paragraphs 0035-0036 of Tanimoto).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanimoto with Namikawa to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 7, Namikawa discloses an image forming apparatus, comprising a main body for forming images on paper sheets (see column 3 lines 44-47 and Fig. 1), an optional device (see column 3 lines 48-57), a first storage medium for storing a control program (see column 3 line 66-column 4 line 3), a control device for controlling image formation of the image forming apparatus by the control program stored in the first storage medium (see column 4 lines 7 and 11-15), a transfer device for transferring the control program from an external device to the first storage medium (see column 4 lines 49-51), a nonvolatile second storage medium for storing a transfer state of the control program (see column 6 lines 1-10), and a power supply (see column 4 lines 46-48 and Fig. 1).

Namikawa does not disclose expressly a power supply control device for controlling power supply to the optional device in response to the transfer state stored in the second storage medium.

Tanimoto discloses a power supply control device for controlling power supply to the optional device in response to the transfer state stored in the second storage medium (see paragraphs 0006-0008, 0011 lines 6-9, 0013, 0019 lines 6-7, and 0022-0034).

Namikawa & Tanimoto are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, printing apparatus with program version upgrade.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the power supply control of an optional device of Tanimoto with the image processing apparatus of Namikawa.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to prevent printer malfunction such as overheating and incorrect drive motor rotation when control program are being upgraded (see paragraphs 0035-0036 of Tanimoto).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanimoto with Namikawa to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Namikawa and Tanimoto disclose the apparatus discussed above in claims 1 and 7, and Namikawa further discloses a write device for writing data that indicates transfer is proceeding onto the second storage medium when transfer of the control program is started, and writing data that indicates transfer is not proceeding onto the second storage medium when transfer of the control program is normally completed (see column 5 line 1-column 6 line 10).

Regarding claims 3 and 9, Namikawa and Tanimoto disclose the apparatus discussed above in claims 1 and 7, and Namikawa further discloses a confirmation device for confirming the transfer state stored in the second storage medium when power is applied to the image processing apparatus (see column 6 lines 1-10, column 7 lines 36-44, and column 8 lines 9-17).

Regarding claims 4 and 10, Namikawa and Tanimoto disclose the apparatus discussed above in claims 3 and 9, however Namikawa does not disclose expressly wherein power supply to the optional device is stopped when it is confirmed by the confirmation device that the data indicating that transfer is processing is stored in the second storage medium.

Tanimoto discloses wherein power supply to the optional device is stopped when it is confirmed by the confirmation device that the data indicating that transfer is processing is stored in the second storage medium (see paragraphs 0006-0008, 0013, and 0022-0034).

Regarding claims 5 and 11, Namikawa and Tanimoto disclose the apparatus discussed above in claims 1 and 7, and Namikawa further discloses a confirmation device for confirming presence of the second storage medium when power is applied to the image processing apparatus (see column 7 line 45-column 9 line 13).

Regarding claims 6 and 12, Namikawa and Tanimoto disclose the apparatus discussed above in claims 5 and 11, however Namikawa does not disclose expressly wherein power supply to the optional device is stopped when it is confirmed by the confirmation device that the second storage medium is not present.

Tanimoto discloses wherein power supply to the optional device is stopped when it is confirmed by the confirmation device that the second storage medium is not present (see paragraphs 0006-0008, 0013, 0022-0025, and 0034).

Namikawa & Tanimoto are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, printing apparatus with program version upgrade.

Art Unit: 2622

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the power supply control of an optional device of Tanimoto with the image processing apparatus of Namikawa.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to prevent printer malfunction such as overheating and incorrect drive motor rotation when control program are being upgraded (see paragraphs 0035-0036 of Tanimoto).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanimoto with Namikawa to obtain the invention as specified in claims 2-6 and 8-12.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark R. Milia whose telephone number is (571) 272-7408. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached at (571) 272-7402. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark R. Milia
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

MRM

JOSEPH R. POKRZYWA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2622
